

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# PCT

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 002184.P002	<b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b>		See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/US2005/002717	International filing date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) 28 January 2005 (28.01.2005)	Priority date ( <i>day/month/year</i> ) 28 January 2004 (28.01.2004)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant NOBEL BIOCARE SERVICES AG			

<p>1. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).</p> <p>2. This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet.</p> <p>In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.</p>																								
<p>3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15px; text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </td> <td style="width: 150px;">Box No. I</td> <td>Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> </td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <input type="checkbox"/> </td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table> <p>4. The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																						
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																						
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																						

	Date of issuance of this report 31 July 2006 (31.07.2006)
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland  Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	Authorized officer  Simin Baharlou  e-mail: pt09@wipo.int

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

PCT REC'D 06 MAY 2005  
WIPO PCT

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Applicant's or agent's file reference  
see form PCT/ISA/220

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

### FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.  
PCT/US2005/002717

International filing date (day/month/year)  
28.01.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)  
28.01.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC  
A61C8/00

Applicant

CANTER, Stanton, R.

#### 1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- Box No. II Priority
- Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

#### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

#### 3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office  
D-80298 Munich  
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d  
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Salvatore, C

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7194



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/US2005/002717

**Box No. I Basis of the opinion**

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
  - This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
  - a. type of material:
    - a sequence listing
    - table(s) related to the sequence listing
  - b. format of material:
    - in written format
    - in computer readable form
  - c. time of filing/furnishing:
    - contained in the international application as filed.
    - filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
    - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.  In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**Box No. II Priority**

- The validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority does not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where required, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.
- This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43bis.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.
3. Additional observations, if necessary:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/US2005/002717

**Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability**

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- the entire international application,  
 claims Nos. 20

because:

- the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):  
 the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):  
 the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.  
 no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 20  
 the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

- the written form                    has not been furnished  
    does not comply with the standard  
the computer readable form       has not been furnished  
    does not comply with the standard

- the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.  
 See separate sheet for further details

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/US2005/002717

**Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or  
industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement**

**1. Statement**

Novelty (N)	Yes:	Claims	3-11,15-19
	No:	Claims	1,2,12-14
Inventive step (IS)	Yes:	Claims	4-10,15-19
	No:	Claims	1-3,11-14
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes:	Claims	1-19
	No:	Claims	

**2. Citations and explanations**

**see separate sheet**

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING  
AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)**

International application No.

PCT/US2005/002717

**Re Item III.**

Claim 20 is a clear violation of R. 67.1 because it claims a medical method. Even removing direct reference to cutting of a molar socket, etc. the claim implicitly includes these steps and is still not allowable.

**Re Item V.**

- 1 Reference is made to the following documents:

D1 : US 2002/160335 A1 (ASHMAN ARTHUR ET AL) 31 October 2002 (2002-10-31)

D2 : US 2001/004711 A1 (LAZZARA RICHARD J ET AL) 21 June 2001 (2001-06-21)

D3 : EP 1 145 691 A (BIOLOK INTERNATIONAL, INC) 17 October 2001 (2001-10-17)

2 INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1, 12

- 2.1 The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1 and 12 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

Documents D1 (Fig.4), D2 (Fig. 1) and D3 (Fig. 3) all disclose an anchoring element having the same outer shape as that of the present application and also having an internal dead-end bore which constitutes the 3rd and 4th surfaces/means.

3 DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Dependent claims 2, 3, 11, 13, 14 do not contain any features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT in respect of novelty and/or inventive step (Article 33(2) and (3) PCT). Documents D1-D3 all have a frusto-conical first portion and means for compressing the interradicular bone, just like is claimed in claims 2, 13, 14. Regarding claims 3, the choice of having a frusto-conical internal bore is an obvious choice available to the skilled person and solves the same technical problem as that solved by the shape of the internal bores in D1-D3, and is thus not inventive.